

### REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are pending in the present application. In an Office Action dated February 10, 2005, claims 1-18 were rejected. The claims, as amended, are listed above. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 1-18 are now pending in the present application.

The present application went abandoned on May 11, 2005 due to a failure to submit a timely response. Subsequently, the present application became active again responsive to a petition to withdraw the holding of abandonment that was granted on May 11, 2006. According to the communication from the Office of Petitions, Art Unit 2677 would re-mail the Office Action to the correspondence address. At this point, no further communication has been received. Thus, Applicant submits this amendment in order to advance prosecution.

Applicant kindly requests that the amendments be entered and that allowance of the pending claims be reconsidered based on the following remarks:

#### Information Disclosure Statement

The IDS dated February 10, 2004 was not considered because a copy of non-patent literature was not provided (i.e., Inside QuickDraw GX Fonts by Erfert Fenton). However, a copy of this reference was subsequently provided in an IDS dated April 4, 2007. Applicant requests that Examiner consider the reference and initial the corresponding IDS.

#### Double Patenting Rejection

Claims 1-8 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-4 of U.S. Patent No. 6,714,199. In response, Applicant has included a terminal disclaimer herewith. Thus, the double patenting rejection has been traversed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Flowers, Jr. (US Patent No. 5,533,174)(“Flowers”) in view of Fenwick (US Patent No. 5,412,771). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Claim 1 is directed towards system for glyph construction. The system comprises:

a graphics system, the graphics system configured to generate a glyph record array;

a glyph server means coupled to the graphics system, the graphics server means comprising a line layout core unit configured to process a layout of glyph codes and generate an updated glyph record array; and

an operating system coupled to the glyph server.

Flowers is generally directed towards a font server that communicates with a workstation 12 and a printer 14 (Abstract). More specifically, Flowers discloses customizing a font by remapping glyphs, rotating or scaling characters and symbols, or adding special kerning pairs or ligatures (3:2-5). Also, Flowers discloses translating fonts into a format compatible with the client’s text processing system and operating system (3:9-14).

However, Flowers fails to teach or suggest the invention as recited in claim 1. For example, claim 1 recites a “graphics system configured to generate a glyph code array.” Also in claim 1, the line layout core updates the glyph code array. By contrast, Flowers merely discloses a station 12 and a printer 14 that requests fonts from a font server 16. Flowers fails to provide the details amounting to a glyph code array. Nor does Flowers specify where the glyph code array is generated and updated.

Additionally, claim 1 recites “a line layout core unit configured to process a layout of glyph codes and generate an updated glyph record array.” As discussed, Flowers lacks disclosure regarding the glyph record array. It follows that Flowers also lacks disclosure regarding any updating of the glyph record array. Nor does Flowers discuss taking a layout of glyph codes into account.

Although Flowers discloses remapping glyphs, manipulating fonts, and translating font formats, Flowers is silent as to obtaining a glyph record array from glyph code layouts.

Fenwick is generally directed towards producing a font for creating a string of glyphs representing characters in a language having a handwritten, or other appearance (Abstract). However, Fenwick fails to cure the deficiencies of Flowers with respect to claim 1.

Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 1, and all related claims, are patentable over Flowers and/ or Fenwick, either alone or in combination. Likewise, claims 8 and 13, and related claims, are patentable because they contain similar limitations similar to claim 1.

CONCLUSION

Applicant's attorney believes this application is in condition for allowance. Should any unresolved issues remain, Examiner is invited to call Applicant's attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

May 21, 2008

/Joseph A. Sawyer, Jr./

Joseph A. Sawyer, Jr.

Reg. No. 30,801

**Customer Number 29141**

(650) 493-4540

(650) 493-4549